

# THE CALCUTTA JOURNAL

Vol. V.]

General Summary of News.

[ No. 185.

*England.*—A short Defence of the Whigs against the imputations cast upon them during the late Election for Westminster has been published in London; and if we may venture to trust to the internal evidence, as well as to certain peculiar allusions, it proceeds from the pen of a Noble and Learned Lord, to whose irresistible eloquence and exertions, these traducers of the Whigs owe more gratitude than to any other individual in the empire. We may be mistaken; but the faithful accumulation of facts, the temperate assertion of their services, the profound constitutional reasoning, and the persuasive tone that runs through the whole, point it out as the work of the great Defender and Patron of the Trial by Jury; and if so, it comes to us with double claims on our attention, since "it is written, or rather dictated, from the bed of sickness." It is cheering to the heart, to see this veteran in the cause of Liberty raise himself in his bed, on learning of the indecent reproaches cast on his fellow-labourers, and with the freshness of youth and vigour, vindicate the Patriots by whose side he has fought, from the unjust obloquy attempted to be thrown upon them.

The Noble Lord shortly recapitulates the instances in which the Whigs have fought within his memory, the battles of the People.

"It was not, I think, till after the long, obstinate, and disastrous war against our American Colonies, so unhappily persisted in, against the most obvious interests and wishes of the nation, that a general spirit of Reform began to prevail in England. This, as I have already observed, was not within the contemplation of the authors of the Revolution; but the spirit and principle of that great reformation having an *universal application* to the support of public freedom, in whatever shape it could be *invaded*, and to the resistance of every encroachment of unauthorised dominion, the Whigs were, accordingly, most forward in giving countenance to this rising spirit among the people.

An attempt to oppose this spirit, by a most dangerous attack on the Liberty of the Press, was made in the case of Dr. Shipley, still Dean of St. Asaph. The late Sir William Jones having written a Dialogue between a Farmer and a Scholar, to illustrate the principles and uses of a free representation of the people, which was circulated in Wales by Dr. Shipley, he was indicted as the publisher of a libel; and, to secure his conviction, an attack upon the rights of Juries, of such long standing, as to have been repeatedly sanctioned by all the Judges, was brought into action against him; or, rather, against the whole people of this land; it being then again solemnly decided, by the whole Court of King's Bench, that a Jury had *no other province* than to find the fact of publishing and writing arraigned before them; *the rest* being, exclusively, matter of law, for the judgment of the Court. A doctrine now admitted, on all hands, to be utterly subversive of the Liberty of the Press, and *through that liberty*, of all the rights and privileges of mankind.

Let me pause, therefore, here, to ask the defumers of the Whigs of England—*how* this hydra was subdued?

The Liberty of the Press and the Rights of Juries were not *so directly* in question at the Revolution; but, as the needle still finds out the Pole, into whatever new region it is carried, so the principles of that modern Magna Charta, of 1688, attaching at once upon every invasion of our free Constitution, the Whigs were, in a manner, instinctively at their posts, and continued at them until the victory over this gross and atrocious usurpation was *exposed, trampled upon, and extinguished for ever*. They were active, to a man, in the support of the accused; and Mr. Fox, at the head of the whole of this band of patriots, *now calumniated as a worthless faction*, brought in, and carried through his Libel Bill, which it would be folly to eulogise, because it is universally admitted to be a statute, which, if expunged from our records, would as completely and effectually destroy the freedom of speech and of writing, as if the King were dethroned by an invasion of the Turks.

The next conjecture, material to be referred to, is the *first burst* of the French Revolution. Upon that awful and afflicting occasion, when a great people, not at all circumstanced like our ancestors at the Revolution, were driven almost to madness in a contention for their rights, the Whigs cannot surely be charged with having fallen short of their bold and free spirit in defence of freedom, wherever overpowered or shaken: on the contrary, it is a fact, almost too notorious to be fitly re-

called to memory, that many of the most eminent of that body, following their great leader, Mr. Fox, were accused by others of *their own body*, as Republicans, who sought to introduce anarchy by overshadowing the sober and regulated character of our own Revolution, already adverted to, in their inflamed zeal for the suffering people of France. It is equally notorious, that, upon the same principle, they opposed and stigmatised the war with France, until it had assumed a character when the rights of other nations were invaded. For although the Governments of those nations, by their unjust and unprincipled interference in the beginning of the French Revolution, undoubtedly drew upon themselves all the calamities which their Princes and people suffered, yet it became incompatible with the peace and safety of the world, that France should be permitted to grasp at such an immense, and seemingly boundless, dominion. Indeed, before the war in question had been declared by this country, the calumniated Whigs of England, seeking to illustrate their uniform adherence to the principles of our own Constitution, formed themselves into a society or association for a reform in the Representation of the People in the House of Commons. On that occasion they published a Declaration, drawn up by the late Sir Philip Francis, a member of their body, which I will venture to affirm to be above all objection, by any person who looks to *what is practicable* and who has sense and reflection enough to bear in mind, that whatever passes the *sober medium* has a certain tendency to defeat every reformation *whatsoever*, by creating an alarm, which Government is sure to turn to its own account.

This, indeed, actually and most unfortunately happened. The Whigs had not many days published their Declaration, which exposed every inequality in our Representation, and recommended their removal with equal wisdom and eloquence, than the Reformers of the Constitutional and Corresponding Societies, so publicly and pointedly opposed it, questioning even the sincerity of its authors, that it was thought necessary to repel their calumnies, which was done in a most excellent paper, drawn up by the late Mr. George Rous, a most enlightened member of the Friends of the People, and the Whigs of this Society pursued their original object with spirit and perseverance, having, soon afterwards, requested the present Earl Grey, then a member of the House of Commons, to bring their Declaration before Parliament: and the present Lord Erskine, then member for Portsmouth, to second the motion. This proceeding was immediately and most faithfully carried into effect, for which I have only to refer to the memories of many still living, and to the parliamentary proceedings of the time, in the hands of almost every person at all conversant in political history or events. By this reference the Whig Reformers will appear to have zealously pursued their purpose, and could not be at all responsible for the rejection, by the House of Commons, of the Plan of Reform which they had proposed.

Let us now see whether the bolder and more enlightened Reformers, who then suspected and now caluminate the Whigs, were on their parts, more successful.

Here again the facts are unhappily too notorious. They appointed delegates in all parts of the kingdom, and organized a general system of correspondence, in terms so rash and incautious, in many instances, indeed, so criminally and dangerously licentious, that their papers were seized by Government, and a few amongst them, selected as their leaders, were taken into custody by warrants from the Secretary of State. On this occasion the Whigs, who never considered these proceedings, however inimical to the success of Reformation, to be of that alarming and traitorous character in which they were regarded by Government, might have looked on with a malignant satisfaction at the disasters of those who had suspected their principles and ridiculed their exertions; but, on the contrary, the instant that the Privy Council, and both Houses of Parliament, sitting in judgment on the evidence, had declared the prisoners to be *traitors*, and had indicted them upon the statute of Edward the Third, for compassing and imagining the death of the King, and for levying war against him in his realm, then the whole body of the now calumniated Whigs, faithful to the principles of the Revolution, were again in a manner instinctively at their posts; and Lord Erskine, then at the bar, was requested, or rather urged by every Whig in Eng-

land, to give up his lucrative business in the Court of King's Bench, and to attend gratuitously at the Old Bailey, at the risk of his health, and almost of his life, to save his brother Reformers from being hanged. Every body must remember, that Mr. Fox, and all the eminent members of the Opposition, were constantly attendant upon the trials, and London, perhaps, never exhibited two more august and splendid spectacles than the processions through her streets on the acquittal of the prisoners. And here too, let me refer to the parliamentary proceedings of that day for the noble exertions of Mr. Fox, and all the Whigs, against the dangerous doctrine of *constructive treasons*."

The Noble and Learned Lord proceeds—"Several other occasions presented themselves, about the same period, which called for the strenuous exertions of the Whigs for the preservation of public freedom; all of them proceeding from the violence and rashness of bolder and more active Reformers. I allude to the Bills, which were then passed, to prohibit meetings of the people, and which, but for those exertions, might have been made permanent, like others now in existence of the same description, to which I shall presently refer: and, although all these excesses had arisen out of a departure from the better judged proceedings of the Whigs, yet they were equally faithful in their opposition to every invasion or abridgment of public liberty; but it was impossible, at the same time, not to see, that every excess of that description became an instrument in the hands of Government to beat down any advance, even to the most moderate and temperate Reformation.

It was, therefore, with equal surprise and indignation, that, not very long afterwards, I saw reflections upon Lord Grey, probably proceeding from the same quarter, for having abandoned, or at least as having become lukewarm in the cause of Reform, which he had himself originated in the House of Commons. That Noble Lord was placed, by all the violent proceedings I have alluded to, in a perfectly new situation. If, indeed, by his persisting in the pursuit of Reform was meant only a perseverance in fruitless declamation, the high character of his eloquence would have left his silence without excuse; but, if, on the other hand, a reasonable expectation, or even a possible chance of any opening to success would alone have justified his active perseverance, much more if it was quite manifest, that it must have been *mischievous*, he showed by his forbearance the honour, manliness, and wisdom, for which he is so highly and justly distinguished. A man, who is engaged in an enterprise of a political description, like the commander of a military enterprise, must look at the forces of his adversary: and Lord Grey could not possibly look into the camp of Government without seeing the formidable auxiliaries it had received from the alarms which rashness and violence had produced, and the formidable power which had followed, as of course, to the Ministers of the Crown: but Lord Grey never did, directly or indirectly, in spite of all those accumulating difficulties, abandon the Reform of Parliament, but only declared, with regret, that from circumstances, which unfortunately had occurred since he originally considered the subject, he should not, perhaps, be prepared at once to propose the same extended alteration in the Representation of the People as he had formerly proposed in the House of Commons. Now, in my opinion, who am myself devoted as much as ever to a Reform in Parliament, for reasons which I will give hereafter, Lord Grey deserves the highest praise for this honest, manly, and useful declaration: it proved that he was not to be misled himself, nor capable of misleading others, by a vain thirst for popular applause; but that he looked to what was practicable and useful, even though it might involve him in the confession that he had been mistaken. It should be remembered also, that Lord Grey was no longer a Commoner but a Peer, and therefore less entitled to originate a Reform in the House of Parliament.

It is impossible to quit this part of the subject without following it up by adverting to very recent proceedings of the same character and description, which have placed Reform at a more unfortunate distance, giving rise also not only to a temporary suspension of our liberties, but even to permanent abridgments of the immemorial privileges of the people. Here again the Whigs—and scarcely two years have elapsed since their united and eloquent exertions were again most imperiously called for—opposed, with one voice, the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act: they condemned all the acts of violence committed under the colour of magistracy, on an unprotected helpless people; they reprobated, above all, the Act of Indemnity which disappointed all redress, and Lord Grey, in particular, supported by the whole Whig Party, now calumniated, went still a step farther for the future security of the subject.—He denied the power of magistrates to arrest and hold to bail for writings deemed by them to be libellous, before indictments found, maintaining his proposition by the most unanswerable argu-

ment ever delivered in any Parliament or Court of Justice; and, in the following session, a Bill was introduced by Lord Erskine, into the House of Lords, in support of Lord Grey's doctrine, to declare this power exercised by the magistrates to have been illegal. Both these exertions for public liberty were seconded by the Whigs, now calumniated, who surely could not be responsible for the rejection by Parliament, of the views they entertained on that important subject.

Upon both the last occasions, when the Act of Habeas Corpus was suspended, and Secret Committees were appointed by both Houses of Parliament, to investigate the extent and causes of the commotions throughout the country, it appeared, that the multitude, most implicated in those excesses, had borne all their privations and distresses with unexampled patience; and that the two points upon which they were combined, or rather maddened, were, the opposition to Machinery, and the Reform of Parliament; both of them, as they sought their accomplishment, destructive alike of their happiness and security. With the breaking up of Machinery the whole system of our Manufactures must have been broken up also; whilst the visionary and unattainable changes to which they had been excited, and the alarms they had created, removed to a much greater distance every rational object of Reform, which the more enlightened parts of the public might otherwise have exerted themselves to obtain. This is in itself a complete answer to every syllable that has been or can be uttered against those amongst the Whigs, who at any former period were active in this great national cause, whose well-considered and regular proceedings have been suspended, but it is hoped, not finally defeated.

#### AFRICA.

The following is the latest intelligence from the Cape of Good Hope, and is from the Cape Town Gazette of the 26th of June, as transcribed in the Bombay Courier.

Every thing on the Frontier remains quiet; the Caffers have ceased their depredations and incursions for some time past; but the armed inhabitants are anxiously awaiting Col. Wiltshire's orders to move beyond the Fish River. The Horse sickness has disappeared, and the Horses for the remount of the Zwellendam Command, and of such Burghers from the other Districts, as have lost their Horses by the fatal distemper, have proceeded towards Graham's Town. Meanwhile, Commandant Linde, impatient at inaction, had led a strong dismounted Patrol through the thick wood at Trompetter's Drift, and having fallen in with a party of Caffers lurking there with plunder, he succeeded in recapturing above 200 head of Colonial Cattle; 12 Caffers fell in this rencontre.

Mr. Anderson, the Missionary at Griqua Town, has by His Excellency the Governor's desire, communicated with the Tribes of Briquas and Beshuanas, and with the numerous Bassards in his own vicinity, on the subject of establishing a Fair at the Kockontem, in the Beaufort District, in conformity to the Proclamation of 27th Nov. last, and the Tribes have expressed their great satisfaction at the proposal. The months of April and Sept. are considered the best for this purpose: but they have particularly requested, that Wednesday the 4th of August next may be the day fixed for their repairing to the Kook: the Landdrost of Graaff-Reynet has very properly notified to them his acquiescence in this request, and the 4th of August next is therefore, the day next fixed for the First Fair on the borders of this Colony.

#### ASIA.

*Bombay.*—Among the donations which have been lately made to the Education Society, we cannot omit to notice a very liberal subscription (announced at the last meeting of the Committee) from several of the officers and men of H. M. 67th Regiment, amounting to about 700 rupees; at the same time a letter from Major Thatcher communicating an annual subscription of 200 rupees from the officers of the 2d Battalion of the 9th Regiment. It is much to be wished that the example set by this battalion, and the 1st of the 3d two years since, were followed by the service at large; and when it is considered that many children in the school are the orphans of officers, who from the circumstances of their birth are precluded from the benefit of the Military Fund, and who but for this benevolent Institution must otherwise have been abandoned to want and misery, it is not too much to hope that every Regiment in the service will come forward with a similar annual subscription. Both at Calcutta and Madras, we believe a certain sum is deducted monthly from the pay of every officer towards the Military Asylum.

**Rangoon.**—The picture which we gave of the tyranny and cruelty of the Government of Ava, in one of our late Numbers, related only to the higher departments of the state. The following which is handed to us as an authentic document, may serve to shew the conduct of its officers to inferior ranks. It is given in the shape of a Protest, of which we preserve, with very trifling alterations of language the original form:

"On the 6th of January, 1819, two men, Ally, a lascar, and Pedro, a Topass, deserted from the brig Hope, and going to the Minister, (Viceroy of Rangoon) gave themselves up as slaves, and on the 18th of February, Antonio, cook, also himself absented from my house, and in the same manner became a slave.

On the 20th, these three deserters came from the Minister's house, demanding their wages and clothes, and threatening if I did not immediately comply with their demands, that they would take me to the Minister's and have me well flogged. I refused, on the ground of their having forfeited all that had been due to them, by their desertion. On hearing this reply, they loaded me with abuse and retired.

On the 21st at 7 a. m. the Minister's linguist came to me, attended by several peons and three deserters, demanding their wages. I told the linguist that I should not pay them, as I had in concert with Mr. Gibson, the Shahbunder, drawn up a petition to the Minister for the restoration of my men, as they had shipped with me at the Port of Penang, and left, me without any cause for so doing. At 9 a. m. I went with Mr. Gibson and the linguist to the Minister's house, in order to present my petition, when after I had been detained two hours, the two men, Ally and Pedro, finding that they were likely to be sent on board again, swore that I had killed one of the lascars on the passage to Rangoon.

I immediately sent on board for the Serang, Tindal, Gunner, and one Sookannie, who had shipped with me at Penang, to prove the falsehood of the accusation, and to this effect their and my own oaths were instantly taken. The Lascar Ally then swore that the crime with which he had charged me was not committed during the present voyage on the passage here, but in the voyage before, and that I had been tried at Penang by the Police and acquitted, in consequence of the Serang's swearing that the man whom I was thus accused of having murdered, was killed by the falling of a mast; and that the Serang had been bribed to swear this.

The Tindal was then examined as to his having seen me ill-treat any man during the voyage alluded to, and he swore that not a man had been hurt or flogged. In consequence of this direct contradiction, the Serang was ordered to be put in the block (a machine like the stocks in England.) As all my witnesses were of no use, I was ordered to sit down with one of the Minister's guards over me; but was released about an hour afterwards.

On the 22d, at 8 A. M. Mr. Gibson sent for me to his house, where I found the three before-mentioned deserters, and enquired of me, how many months they had been in the brig Hope, and what money they had received from me. I informed him correctly of these particulars, and he then insisted on my paying the full balance of wages due up to the 22d of February; this I did, and Mr. Gibson then further requested me to get as many Europeans as I could, to accompany me to the Minister's house, between the hours of 10 and 12 o'clock, and to bring the petition he had made out for me, with a double barrelled fowling piece as a present to the Minister, that he might settle the business. This I also complied with, and at the appointed time, Mr. Turner, ship-builder, Captains Court, Arbuthnot, Trill, Protheroe and Mr. Jones attended me to the Minister's Office of Justice. When we reached the house, the Minister was asleep, but Mr. Gibson was sitting there.

Shortly after our arrival at the Office, Mr. Jones left us to go and see the Serang; he found him lying on the ground, with his hands lashed to his feet, and a Burmah beating him with a large rattan, desiring him to tell the truth, as to when and where Captain Thisselle killed the man, and whether he was not tried at Penang and acquitted. They (the Burmahs surrounding him) said if he would tell the truth, they would let him loose. The Serang said he had spoken the truth before. Mr. Jones then came and informed us of this, and Captains Court, Arbuthnot, and myself, went to the place where the Serang was, as before stated. I was asked several questions by the Burmahs round him, respecting the supposed deceased, and they said they were fully convinced that I had killed a man, somewhere or other, and upon my denying it, I was forcibly dragged away and both my legs put in the blocks in the presence of the abovementioned gentlemen; the door of the prison shut, and none of the Europeans permitted to see me.

The men in charge of the blocks endeavoured to extort 50 ticals from me, and upon my refusing to pay it, they put my legs in two holes further apart and shut the blocks, which pressing hard upon my legs soon deprived me of feeling as high as the knee. I remained in that state about two hours, during which time I was severely beaten between the shoulders by men's elbows and fists in order to extort money from me, till at length an order came to release me from the blocks but not from confinement. In a short time after I was released, the blood in my legs had so far circulated as to enable me to stand up. The before-mentioned gentlemen then went with Mr. Gibson before the Minister, when my petition was read, as was also that of Ally, to which the Minister's answer was, that he believed Ally, was speaking the truth, after saying which he immediately went away, Mr. Gibson told all the gentlemen who attended me, that they had better go away and he would endeavour to get me clear. In the evening I was informed by one of Mr. Gibson's men that I was to be set at liberty on the following morning and I accordingly remained a prisoner during the night.

On the 23d, at 7 in the evening, an order came for me and the Serang to be released, when I went to my house, and the Serang returned on board.

On the 24th, a bill was sent to me demanding 580 ticals, which I was obliged to pay to the Minister.

I do hereby protest against the Government of Rangoon, for all and every damage I have sustained, viz. false imprisonment, detention, &c. &c."

(Signed) PAUL THISSELLE.

We, the undersigned, do hereby declare and attest that the abovementioned statement is correct, as far as we are concerned, and do give it as our opinion that the conduct of the Rangoon Government is infamous in the extreme.

(Signed)

JOHN ARBUTHNOT.

T. R. COURT, *Commander of the Byrangore.*

G. COWPER, *Master of the Sloop Mary.*

JOHN DANIEL, *Commanding the Ship Four Sisters.*

L. PROTHEROE, *late Commander of the Ship Cornwall.*

R. G. TRILL, *Commanding the Ship Sussex.*

Annexed to the above Protest and Attestation, is an extract from the Log of the Brig Hope, proving that she was detained for her order to go down the river, from the 1st of March to the 7th, and that of the arms belonging to her lodged in the King's godown, sixteen muskets had been taken to the Minister, by whom, after much trouble and delay, four of them were restored, but the rest he kept, paying for them, the price he himself put upon them, which was much less than half their value.

**Dinapore, Aug. 30.**—The first Division of the 11th Light Dragoons arrived here on the 27th, and sailed for the Upper Stations on the 28th. They were all well, and had met with no accidents during their passage from Calcutta.

We have now fine refreshing showers daily, which are productive of the most beneficial effects to the country about the cantonments. The spirits of the natives have risen from cheerless despondency to the most flattering anticipations, and the prices of various articles: as attah, flour, rice, and vegetables, have lowered considerably. The river is very full, and presents a grand and beautiful scene; numbers of boats are continually passing to the Upper Provinces, and the 21st Light Dragoons lately passed downwards in their progress to the Presidency,—all well.

I am happy to add, that the station is free from any epidemic disease, and that the troops are much healthier than they have been for some time past. The late prevailing disorder was a fever, attended generally on the second day with delirium, and in several instances fatal on the third. There is not the least doubt that it had its origin in the continued heat of the weather, unaccompanied, for a considerable time, with the least moisture; as it has ceased now that the air and earth are cooled and refreshed by frequent showers.

**Vestry Meeting.**—The Friends of free discussion will rejoice to find by an Advertisement in the Government Gazette, that a Meeting at the Town Hall is at length authorized by the Government, and invited in a regular way by the Sheriff, for the final consideration of the Vestry Question.

We shall say no more upon the subject at present than express a hope that every Englishman who values the rights by which he is distinguished from the subjects of every other kingdom on the globe, will attend this call, and add the weight of his voice and influence to the deservedly popular side of the cause.

## Queries for the Meeting.

To the Editor of the Calcutta Journal.

SIR, Observing in all the Papers of this-day, a Notification from the Sheriff, informing us, that there will be a Meeting of the Inhabitants of Calcutta, at the Town Hall on Wednesday the 22d instant, for the purposes mentioned in Messrs. R. C. and T. PLOWDEN'S Letter thereunto annexed; I wish to know, before I give myself the trouble of coming in from Garden Reach, whether or not I have a right to attend, and am entitled to vote, not being an Inhabitant of Calcutta, although a tolerably constant attendant at Church in the morning, when the weather permits, and in the evenings during moon-light; and having also been in the habit of paying my Gold Mohur at the Easter and Christmas Collections.

Whether that sum, or how much, entitles a Churchman to vote, I do not know. I do not mean by this to say, that the payment of One Gold Mohur at one payment is necessary, because many good and honest men pay a Rupee, and this mite, if paid by a Parishioner, ought to be as good as the payment of him who can give 500 Rupees at a collection; but I think that something will be necessary to be communicated on this head, before this Meeting takes place, either through the medium of your Journal or some other Paper, in order that we may know whether all who have never even seen the inside of St. John's Cathedral have a right of voting, or, who in reality have that right.

A Reply to these Queries, from some one of the leading Members of the proposed Meeting, will save much loss of time, and prevent much idle speaking at the Meeting itself; as I heard several persons at the Exchange to-day declare their intention of being present, and even of speaking on the occasion, although they have never I believe been in any other Church than St. Andrew's, in India, and have not even given a Rupee to the support of our Poor, nor are indeed in any way entitled themselves to say Aye, or No, at a Meeting such as the one in question.

Garden Reach,  
Sept. 10, 1819.

OLD TIMES.

## Veterinary Practice.

To the Editor of the Calcutta Journal.

SIR,

In your Journal of the 7th of July, is a Letter signed W. P. M. and dated from Patna the 27th of June, recommending the external application of Arsenic, in the treatment of Bursautie in the Horse. The above writer affirms, that "its use in human medicine was discontinued from its poisonous effects on the system by absorption, but as this mineral may be given to the horse in large doses not only without danger, but even with advantage to his condition, the same objections did not obtain;" and again, "I have at this moment two cases of Bursautie sores, situated in the heels, where it is difficult, if not impracticable, to extirpate the diseased masses. The horse takes twenty grains of white Arsenic daily, and is in the highest condition."

The above observations are further confined in another Letter from the same writer, dated 25th of July, and inserted in your Journal of the 3d of August, in words to the following effect: "even were Arsenic as innocuous when taken into the human system, as it is known to be in respect to its constitutional effects when given in large doses to the horse, &c."

Now I know it to be a positive fact that a horse belonging to W. P. M. which had Bursautie sores, and was treated according to the practice he recommends, DIED between the two dates abovementioned, and I have every reason to believe, that it was the identical horse said to have been in the highest condition under a course of Arsenic on the 27th of June.

I therefore do not hesitate to say, that it was uncandid and disingenuous in W. P. M. (to say the least of it) not to have disclosed this circumstance in his second Letter, and undeceived the Public in respect to the innocence of Arsenic, as applied to the horse in large doses.

It is possible that he did not attribute the death of the horse alluded to, to the Arsenic (for who likes to suppose any thing against a favorite theory or practice?) but undoubtedly it was his duty to have given the simple fact, and left it to your readers to have drawn the inference.

This incident reminds me of the Irishman who flattered himself that he had discovered a method of training a horse to exist without food, but alas! the animal died just as he was beginning to get accustomed to such wholesome treatment.

W. P. M.'s mode of treating the Kumree, I consider even less to be depended on, than that of the Bursautie, at least I know that it has often been tried at the Honorable Company's Stud without one single instance of perfect cure in a real case of Kumree.

HUMBBUG.

Patna, August 12, 1819.

## Brevet Rank.

To the Editor of the Calcutta Journal.

SIR,

I find the SOLDIER OF FORTUNE has again addressed you, chiefly for the purpose of pointing out what, by a strange misconception of the meaning of the term, he denominates my *incompetencies*.

The first instance which he adduces to prove that I know not what I am talking about, will at once show the singularity of his ideas regarding incongruities; for I am positively certain that no other person will pronounce me inconsistent from a perusal of it. He states my having asserted that "delicacy of feeling will, and does, always, prevent Commandants from detaching an Officer under another who has superseded him," and in another place that a Commanding Officer would hardly be guilty of such an act of injustice as to deprive another of his regular tour of command merely to give a Friend an opportunity of signaling himself. These statements he says prove my inconsistency! Will not the very same regard to delicacy, which influences a Commanding Officer in the first case, likewise prevail upon him in the second, particularly when backed by the persuasions of justice.

As to his quotation of my expression relative to disproportionate praise being bestowed on a young Officer of interest, it cannot apply at all in the present case; because the justice or injustice—delicacy or indelicacy—of detaching one Officer in preference to another, can have nothing at all to do with extolling him afterwards, no matter whether deservedly or otherwise. If I have misquoted him, as he says, it can only be in terms; for his words are a *personal*, and mine a *particular* friend—but this was not intentional on my part, nor is it of greater consequence than his misquotation of my sentence as first transcribed by him.

Another misconception which he pronounces me to have fallen into, I shall grant; provided that he will acknowledge having *meant* one thing and *said* another—but without this *proviso*, I must support my consistency. He tells me that when I say "if he and I were *exactly* equal in point of merit, &c." I have misunderstood him; because he did not speak of that kind of equality, but of equality of *Rank*. Now, Sir, observe his *own words*, as hereafter transcribed from his first letter. "When therefore selection is confined, as it generally is, to one rank, suppose a Commander does fix upon a *personal* friend as the *successful* candidate, as *Primus inter Pares*," &c.

I shall leave it to his own candour to say whether the meaning which would naturally be put upon that sentence, is not this, that five or six meritorious Officers, each of whom has distinguished himself *as much* as the others, and who are of a rank which renders them eligible for the honorary distinction, lay claim to the reward; and that the Commanding Officer, seeing all their merits *equal*, and therefore not knowing which to prefer, selects his *own friend* for promotion, thereby calling in partiality to the aid of judgment. If that be not the only inference which any third person would draw from the above sentence, I shall confess myself not only mistaken but really very much astonished.

He deceives himself if he thinks I (or, I believe, "those who side with me either) assume the mere circumstance of being selected for a particular service, as constituting merit," for where have either they or I even *hinted* at such an assumption? I always maintained (and not in very unintelligible language) that such selection as he spoke of, would give an Officer an *unfair* opportunity of acquiring merit, by passing over another whose *right* it was to be sent on the command; and I wish he would quote any of my Letters to prove that I ever made such an assumption as he imputes to me.

I see no other part of his singular production which requires an answer; though if there were, you have inserted first before his own, as good a Letter as any I have seen on the subject—and to which I refer this SOLDIER OF FORTUNE, and likewise my Berhampore Opponent. I cannot help flattering myself on the correctness of my observations on the SOLDIER OF FORTUNE's first Letter, because they agree so exactly with that signed W. We have both hit upon the same expressions, and both thought the Writer must have been aiming at *waggery*, as we could hardly suppose such arguments or such *flourishes* seriously brought forward.

September 10, 1819.

A FRIEND TO THE ARMY.

## Imperial Parliament.

HOUSE OF LORDS.—MAY 17.

His Royal Highness the Duke of Kent, the Earl of Harborough, and the Bishop of Peterborough, took the oaths.

Shortly after four o'clock, when the Private Bills were gone through, the House adjourned during pleasure. Just before five o'clock, the rush to obtain an entrance by persons who had admissions from Peers, owing to the crowded state of the avenues, was as terrible as any like occurrence at the other House. Gentlemen who attended for the public press found themselves as much inconvenienced as the nearest loiterer on the lobbies. Not the slightest accommodation was shewn. Several of the Reporters were compelled to mingle in the general rush; and but for the interference of Mr. Lee, the High Constable, it is more than probable that sad accidents would have happened.

We understood that before the debate, there were some Petitions presented against the Catholic Claims, amongst which was one from Manchester by Lord Kenyon, but the greater part of the titles could not be satisfactorily heard.

### FINANCIAL RESOLUTIONS.

The Earl of HARROWBY rose and, after adverting to his promise on a former evening, laid upon the Table a Resolution or Resolutions as preparatory to a discussion which stands for Friday next, touching the Bank Reports, in consequence of the intimation he had thrown out. The Resolution, as we collected it, recommended the House to continue the Restriction as to Cash-Payments by the Bank till the period now limited by Parliament, then to exchange its notes for gold, assayed and stamped at 4l. 1s. the ounce; that the next payment should be in bars, similarly assayed and stamped, at the rate of 3l. 19s. 6d. per ounce; that the third payment should be also in bars of 3l. 17s. 10½d. the ounce, or Mint price; and, finally, that there should be fixed a further period for the definitive Resumption of Cash Payments by the Bank.—Laid upon the Table, ordered to be printed, and taken into consideration on Friday next.

### CATHOLIC QUESTION.

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE in a very weak voice, observed, that in calling on their Lordships to go into the consideration of the Petitions now lying on their Table from his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, and in looking at the course of policy to be pursued by him, he would candidly state to their Lordships that it was his intention most humbly to move a Resolution for the appointment of a Committee of the whole House, to consider the existing laws in reference to Roman Catholics, with regard to taking the oaths necessary to qualify them for holding of places of trust, and to report as to whether, or in what manner, such oaths might be modified. To him it appeared that nothing could be more impolitic, than that so large a portion of his Majesty's subjects as four-fifths of the population of that part of the United Kingdom called Ireland, and making one-fourth of the population of the kingdom at large, should be so disqualified, and rendered incapable of serving their common country. They were disqualified, not for any civil misconduct, but because they did not profess the religion of the State, and continued conscientiously to communicate with the Church of Rome. That such was indeed the real fact, he (Lord Donoughmore) believed no person would at the present day deny; yet, notwithstanding, our Statute Books continued to fix imputations of the most atrocious nature on the professors of that faith, was not it still imputed to the Roman Catholics of the United Kingdom, that they held no oath to be binding if taken to persons of another church? If so gross an imputation was believed to be a genuine description of Catholicism in past times, under the dominion of ignorance, the whole experience of the last century was sufficient to contradict the stigma; and particularly the events of the last forty years, which ought to cover the enemies of his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects with confusion.

No person now, he believed, could be induced to sanction such abominable and atrocious ideas as he had alluded to, the absurdity of which, indeed, was equal to their atrocity; and, upon this subject, he begged their Lordships to recollect the contents of a celebrated speech delivered in the other House (we supposed by Mr. Peel), and in another Parliament, which disclaimed those imputations on them, while opposing their claims. Even the Noble Lord in the blue ribband had confined his objections to considerations of policy, and the question of admitting an iota of foreign jurisdiction in the administration of the Government. Their Lordships would, therefore, see that the position of the Catholic Question was greatly changed from what it formerly was; all Antichristian principles and uncharitable surmises were disavowed by its opponents in either House; and the great objection was limited to the existence of an arguable supremacy which was supposed inherent in a foreign State. If what he stated were true, and he believed it would hardly be disputed to be, then, in the name of common sense, what objection could the Noble Earl possibly have to expunge an obnoxious declaration from our Statute Book, which did nothing but insult one party of men, and served to deceive the other? It was impossible for him to conceive what benefit could result from preserving an obnoxious portion of an oath, which went to apply to persons a cruel, because an unjust imputation, that they excommunicated all who differed from them as heretics? Yet such was the preamble of an oath. If he were allowed to go into the Committee, he would, after getting rid of the declaration, next dispose of the oath of supremacy, when there would remain no vestige of

such tests, except the oath of abjuration, now of no practical use, as it was aimed at a non-existent family. But he was aware that he should make a most impotent conclusion indeed, if he stopped here; it would be an unsaying of all he had said, and an undoing of all he had done; it would amount to a prevaricating and falsifying of his past life, if, having thus succeeded, he hesitated to assert that his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects were entitled to their free share in the privileges of the Constitution, and ought to be admitted to them. Upon all grounds, he held his argument to be clear, and was satisfied it was more difficult to shew why our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects should be excluded from their rights, than why they should be reinstated. He regretted that he was not well enough to speak more at length.—Cries of (*Hear!*)—or go into details, and therefore should conclude by moving for a Committee, as described in the outset of his remarks.

Upon the question being put by the LORD CHANCELLOR,

The Bishop of WORCESTER said he should not have risen so early had he not wished to set himself right in one or two particulars. He understood that a strange notion was afloat in the world, that a professional member of the Church of England must of necessity be hostile to the Roman Catholics, and interested to withhold their rightful claims. It might be hoped that the feeling of charity would be sufficient to refute such an opinion, especially as to the professors of religions where so many points were alike, and where there was so much to value on both sides; but error was liable to mix with all institutions, and to combat what appeared to be erroneous, was the duty of an honest mind. So far from illiberality to those who differed from him, he could truly say, that he never saw a human creature, be he of what persuasion he might, offer up his prayers with reverence and love to the great Author of Being, but he esteemed the man, and honoured the feeling that dictated the pious act. Grievances he thought required to be redressed. He hoped that all who were aggrieved by existing laws, supposing those grievances to be removable, so seek redress by every fair constitutional means. But their Lordships could not be ignorant how much the pressure of law had been lightened of late years, particularly respecting their Catholic fellow-subjects, and how greatly the benefits of toleration had been extended on all sides. With no desire to retract their steps, he must own, however, that he certainly should not like to see an active and zealous Roman Catholic high in command at sea or on land. Every one must allow that the few restrictive laws were mildly put in execution as affecting them; and so he trusted they ever would be, unless some emergency should call for an enforcement that must always be deprecated. But their candour was appealed to. Candour, he admitted, was most excellent when under the guardianship of reason and truth; but otherwise it degenerated from virtuous strength, and became both sickly and contaminating. Here the contending parties were of momentous weight, they were the Roman Catholics and the English Constitution; and the question was, how far the admission of the first might endanger the stability of the last. If, indeed, the Noble Lords opposite could persuade him that no mischief would happen to the Constitution from the admission of the Catholics to all its rights, he, perhaps, might have no objection in yielding them. Considerable stress was continually laid upon the writings of learned men, but, without at the same time disparaging the merits of their opinions, it had often struck him whether they were most competent to determine nice questions in reference to a system like ours, whose regulations had originated in fitness and circumstances. He had always held it a wise and fit principle, that those who occupied the offices of State should profess the religion of the establishment, if that establishment was designed to remain still identified with the State; and if it would be dangerous to admit those to power who are indifferent to the interests of the Church, how much more dangerous would be the admission of those who were hostile to it, and who should even wish to establish their own religion in the State.

The Noble Lords opposite had their own view, he doubted not, that was entertained by many who felt a sincere attachment to the national Church. If the Catholics had the full possession of honour and power, any general disclaimer of superiority would be taken with great caution, as difficult to be estimated or acted on. Did their Lordships think that the irritation of the Catholics would be allayed by granting their present claims? If so, he could only say, that, instead of being so allayed, he believed it would be increased ten fold; as, when once pre-eminent in the State, the Catholic would naturally be more desirous than ever to restore his religion with him, the establishing of which, necessarily, would be paramount to his other views. Suppose the case of a Lord Lieutenant of Ireland—[Here the Right Rev. Prelate spoke of Earl Talbot in high terms, as not alluding in the remotest sense to him]—sent over to that country with the feelings and impulses he had glanced at, that he was continually bent on recommending his Catholic friends to the promotion of the Crown—caressing them at the Castle—what in all probability would be the consequence? Take it for granted that they were relieved from all disqualifying laws tolerated in their religion, enjoying the elective franchise, but not daring to realise the consummation of all so devoutly wished for, the restoration of their ancient Church! Consider the consequences. Would they not, referring to the re-establishment of their religion, say—"You have granted us so much, why leave us any thing to want? why not give us this last boon, dearest of all behests, the reenthronement of our mother Church?" Nothing would be more natural. It was difficult to say what irritation the refusal of such a request might occasion when so made. Irritation was, however, the furthest from his own wish; and if he said any thing, although but inadvertently, that appeared to prejudice the impartial truth, he had to apologise to their Lordships. He felt difficulty in saying what might actuate

the minds of other men, yet it was not so difficult to say what did not actuate his mind. Uncharitableness, he hoped and trusted, could not be charged in his opposition. He had endeavoured to discharge with faithfulness what he conceived to be his duty in this crisis of the State, and he hoped their Lordships would excuse the trouble he had given them.

The Bishop of NORWICH had remarked with great satisfaction, the temper and manner in which the Noble Lord (Donoughmore) introduced his motion to the House. While saying this, he felt sorry to differ from the Right Rev. Prelate who had just addressed that House; but, notwithstanding their differences, he, for himself, would not yield to any of his Learned Brethren in a cordial attachment to the Established Church, though they differed as to the means of promoting its prosperity, which he held, could never be done by spreading false and feverish alarms to the detriment of those who differed from her. He was happy to bear testimony against the mischievous clamour, that the Church of England would be endangered if the Claims of his Majesty's Catholic subjects were acceded to by Parliament. It was impossible that the Church could be in danger at any time except from the neglect of that precept of her religion, which enjoined, that we would men should do unto us as do we unto them. Never would the Church of England be so effectually supported as by adopting sound and liberal ideas. She wanted not to be fenced with Corporation and Test Acts; and the broader her foundation was, the safer she would stand. So indubitable were these simple truths, although so slow of reception, he should be ashamed to trouble their Lordships by dwelling on them. Nor would he enter into a detail of the oaths, whether as prescribed or commented on by Cranmer, for it was enough to be assured that our Catholic fellow-subjects were willing to take the Oath of Supremacy in its present form, as, indeed, no sensible man could object to it, when it only went to declare that no foreign Prince or Power could be suffered to hold supremacy in this realm. Their Lordships might rest assured, at all events, that things could not continue to go on as they were in the present enlightened state of the public mind. The system had subsisted too long; under the feeling of nonconformity it was extended to Scotland; and, yet what person would venture to say that there existed a more brave or loyal race? Scotland held her spiritual authority quite independent of England. It resided not in the decretal of the Crown, but in the General Assembly of her own church. With respect to the Protestant Dissenters, the case was nearly the same, as they admitted of no interference in matters of conscience from Princes or Kings.

Let their Lordships turn over the historic page, and say, upon their honour, if ever men more loyal to the House of Brunswick in even the worst of times, or more steadfast in supporting the principles of the Revolution of 1688, had been found than Protestant Dissenters were. But their Lordships might be reminded that neither of these cases was referable to that species of interest from abroad which fettered the Catholic cause; yet what would they say if he pointed out another sect, specific in their principles and pursuits, who owned a foreign head? Moravians were those he alluded to, who objected to all spiritual interference by authority here, their Bishop still residing in Hungary. Those who wished to create danger would be disappointed in their hopes. Christian benevolence would surmount all sectarian animosities. The long catalogue of hateful Statutes, the relics of a barbarous age, and the burthen of this, must be removed, and give place to a better as well as to a far more brighter scene.—A remarkable change of opinion had lately taken place throughout Europe on this subject of religious toleration.—Princes and Ministers were bound to take into consideration changes of this kind. He had no wish for indiscriminate innovation, but it could not be politic to oppose innovation of every kind, however innocent, and however imperiously called for by circumstances. In this changing scene of human affairs, of human prejudices, and passions, there were times and seasons when it would be unwise not to yield. They should follow the example of some Catholic countries, of Catholic Hungary, and others, in which persons were not excluded from places of trust and power in consequence of their religious belief. England should not be the only country where disabilities and Penal Statutes were continued in force on the score of religion.

The Bishop of PETERBOROUGH said, that if the present question was one merely of religion, it should have his support. If it was an application merely for religious toleration he would be the last to oppose it. The Catholics however had no ground for complaint on that head. They already enjoyed as much religious freedom as the Protestants themselves, or any other sect. What they desired was civil power, admissibility to all places of trust and emolument, however high. This was clear from the tenour of the Petitions upon the Table? It was frequently urged as an argument in support of their claims, that they were suffering on account of religion, that the laws against them were intolerant and unworthy of the present enlightened age. No man would be farther than he from pleading the cause of religious intolerance. It was reprehensible from whatever quarter it may come. He did not mean to argue this question upon the abstract principles charged upon the Catholics, nor upon their abstract opinions, but he could not leave out of his recollection that those principles, though abstract in themselves, were coupled with others that were not so. It may be admitted that men who believed in transubstantiation could be loyal to George the Third, but if they believed that any foreign Potentate or Power hath, or ought to have, religious jurisdiction within these realms, it was impossible they could be so loyal as those whose allegiance, both civil and religious, was centered in George the Third alone. Where the degree of allegiance was thus unequal, the claims and qualifications for filling places of trust and power in the Government must be also unequal. Upon this

ground alone, it appeared to his mind quite clear, that Catholics could not in policy or justice be admitted to an equal participation of rights with Protestants. This objection was not answered by saying that they bore allegiance to the King in temporals, while another power had their spiritual allegiance. The question was not to be considered merely in a civil point of view, it should be looked to with reference to the Church also. Though the boon now asked was of a civil nature, still if it might lead eventually to consequences pregnant with danger to the Church, their Lordships would weigh it maturely before they yielded their consent to such a proposition. Could they be certain that when the Catholics were admitted to an equal participation of civil rights, it would be the ultimatum of their desires? It was in the nature of things that every new accession of power would only stimulate them to desire more. If they succeeded in their present demand, was it not possible that it would terminate in an addition of ecclesiastical authority? It was a mistake to suppose that the Court of Rome had quite relinquished her ancient plans of ambition and ecclesiastical supremacy. She was as desirous of power as ever. The re-establishment of the Jesuits proved this. That Order was founded for the support and propagation of the Pope's authority; it was re-established for the same purpose. In fact, all Roman Catholic Ecclesiastics were bound by oath to extend as much as possible the power of their Church. By a Decree of one of their Councils, and a Bull of Pope Pius IV. they were required, before they could be eligible to any benefice to make this declaration:—*Sanctam, Romanam, Catholicam, et Apostolicam, ecclesiam, et magistrum omnium ecclesiarum agnosco.* They avowed that the Roman Catholic Church was the mother and mistress of all others. The necessary consequence was, that they should be anxious to obtain for the mistress that the servant now enjoyed. There was at least one portion of the Protestant Church, the duration of which must be short if Catholics were admitted to the same power as Protestants. What security could there be for a Protestant King with a Papal Establishment? The possible consequences that might arise from such a state of things were too fearful to think of; but he hoped the decision of their Lordships on that night would remove all cause of apprehension.

The Earl of ROSEBERRY supported the motion, but we could hardly collect any part of his speech. We understood him to say, that the question now was, whether the Catholics of Ireland were to be placed in that situation to which they were entitled by nature, and the Constitution, or were to be for ever excluded from places of civil trust and power. He wondered, after late experience, how any doubt could for a moment be entertained of their allegiance. They served their country both at home and abroad with a zeal that should remove every apprehension, as to their attachment to the Constitution. In the event of another war, when their services might again be required, it would be politic, putting all considerations of justice out of the case, to treat them so that they could feel no unwillingness to serve again. As to the tenets and principles attributed to them, of keeping no faith with heretics, of not being bound by oaths, they appeared to him quite ridiculous, and were completely disproved by their conduct. They were too enlightened a body to be influenced by any such doctrines. He would not enter into the arguments so frequently, and so ably urged in their support. Their Lordships were already familiar with them, and it was not in his power to add any thing to their strength. He would grant the Catholics what they required, not because they demanded it, but because he felt confident, that it was the best policy, and that nothing could tend more to strengthen the Constitution both in Church, and State.

LORD DE DUNSTANVILLE, in a tone that rendered nearly all he said inaudible below the Bar, opposed the motion. If he felt perfectly satisfied that the participation of privileges claimed by the Catholics would have no other effect than to place some of them in situations of civil trust, he might be disposed to acquiesce in it. This however he greatly apprehended would not be the case. At the same time that he opposed any farther concession to them, he thought that all the privileges granted to the Irish Catholics should be extended to the English also.

The LORD CHANCELLOR opposed the motion. If the Noble Earl (Donoughmore) who brought it forward, in place of objecting to the oath of supremacy, told them, what other oaths he meant to propose as a substitute, to reconcile the minds of Protestants to the measure, this, in his opinion, would have been better. It would be desirable that the Noble Earl had stated what he meant to propose in the Committee, if their Lordships should agree to it. Though as warm a friend of religious toleration as any man, he must declare that, as a lawyer, he did not know by what form of oath the Protestants could be satisfied, or how the doctrine of the spiritual supremacy of the Pope, could be reconciled with the King's supremacy. What hopes were there that, consistently with the Constitution, the two could be reconciled in a Committee. If Roman Catholics in 1660, in 1688, and down to the present time, did not admit the tenets attributed to them or to their Church, the Government of this country was guilty of a most scandalous deception. If they looked to what was the opinion of Parliament in the time of Charles II, to what passed in 1688, when a compact was entered into between the people and the Throne, that the Church should be Protestant, and the Crown Protestant, they would find that the known and acknowledged tenets of the Catholics were the motives for the measures then passed. It was an argument commonly employed upon occasions like this, that men should be perfectly free in their religious opinions, and that it was intolerant to visit them for such opinions with civil disqualifications. He was no friend to persecution or intolerance, but a legislator should not forget that religious opinions had political effects, and that places of trust were such as none could fairly claim, except upon the conditions which the Legislature judged necessary for the safety of the State. On these principles it was settled that none but a

Protestant should fill the Throne. It was judged a necessary part of the system, that he was not to be surrounded by Roman Catholics, in the Council, in Parliament, in places of high trust, civil as well as military. This was natural. What security could there be for a Protestant Crown under any other circumstances? To this it might be answered, that Roman Catholics sat in Parliament previous to the time of Charles II. True; but then they were to consider what was done in 1688, as well as by the Act of Union with Scotland, by which the Constitution in Church and State, as it then stood, was guaranteed. Were they now to give up a system, to bring into danger a Constitution under which every religious sect enjoyed more liberty of conscience than was ever known to exist in any former period of their history down to Charles II? Were they to give up all those tests established for the security of the Church and State? After such a proposal as this, he should be surprised at nothing.

The discovery of a North-west passage, or any other event equally improbable, could not surprise him more, than to hear it said that Roman Catholics and others were admissible to Parliament, as well as to places of the important trust, without taking any oaths at all. He could only say, that if there was one such present in the House, he (the Lord Chancellor) would deserve to be impeached if he took his vote that night. Every man in this country owed allegiance, temporal as well as spiritual, to the King. He was acknowledged supreme head of the Church, and in the language of the old books, he was supreme not in temporals alone but in spirituals also. This was the doctrine held out in the ancient Statutes. The Church of England was said to be subject only to the King, even when the Roman Catholic religion was that of the country. In those days, no doubt there were many able men in the civil, naval, and military departments, but did they or could they free the people from the influence of those doctrines respecting the Pope's power, by which the people were immersed in slavery? That great and constitutional lawyer, Lord Hale, said it was necessary for the protection of the country against this power, that the oath of supremacy should exist, that it was the true doctrine of allegiance. He (the Lord Chancellor) would contend that it was the common law of England previous to the reign of Henry VIII. It was the law in the most ancient times. This was the opinion of Lord Coke, as appeared from his treatise on an old Statute of Edward III. Mr. Locke was frequently quoted with reference to the subject of the Catholic Claims, and arguments were drawn from him in their support. That writer no doubt agreed that toleration ought to be given to the extent of opinions that were not dangerous; but he expressly stated that while Roman Catholics held the doctrines they entertained they were not fit subjects for toleration. As great and as constitutional a man as ever sat in that House, upon a solemn occasion, when the laws against Catholics were under consideration, and it was said that allegiance could not be expected from them in their present state of exclusion, asked whether loyalty was to depend on places of trust and emolument. The same able statesman and lawyer (Lord Hardwicke) upon a similar occasion, said it was most important to maintain the Protestant religion. That it ought to be held in reverence as a barrier against ecclesiastical usurpation—(Hear! from the Opposition)—which generally ended in civil tyranny. This shewed he was of opinion that if any person out of the country claimed the spiritual allegiance due to the Crown, it was an ecclesiastical usurpation likely to end in civil tyranny.

Such, he added, would have been the case were it not for the Revolution. The laws therefore passed upon that occasion, whereby Papists were excluded from civil power, were the best security for Church and State. Though Roman Catholics swore over and over again that the Pope had not and ought not to have any jurisdiction, civil or ecclesiastical, within these realms, he did not see how the prayer of their Petitions could be complied with. Their exclusion from Parliament was a fundamental part of the Act of Union with Scotland. To him it appeared very curious that the state of the Protestant dissenters was never attended to with so much anxiety of interest as that of the Roman Catholics. If their Church should become the Established Church of Ireland, which was more than probable, if they were admitted to a full participation of civil power, it should be considered how far that circumstance would endanger the Protestant establishment of this country. When he considered their refusal of the Veto, of domestic nomination, or any other security against foreign influence, it did not appear to him that they were willing to remove just apprehensions with respect to the Protestant Church of Ireland. If it were his opinion that what they asked could be safely granted, nothing would prevent him from consenting to it; but considering what occurred since 1802, he could not be blamed for expressing a wish to see what securities they would offer. They required, it was said, nothing more than they enjoyed before; that even if the existing laws were repealed, but very few could come into Parliament. He must not, however, consider merely that they once enjoyed a right to sit in Parliament, their Lordships should also ask themselves what were the reasons for excluding them. The Noble Lord contended that a constitution of this country was such as to require from those who were eligible to place and the emoluments of office, securities for their acknowledgment of the principles, civil and religious, of this kingdom, an acknowledgment in fact of the principles by which the King held possession of his Throne. His firm opinion was, that this was a measure which every way and from every document he had ever seen was perfectly inconsistent with our religious safety, and the security of a Protestant Throne. Neither was it the way to argue this question, whether many or few persons would be entitled to the many advantages to be derived from the proposed increase of their privileges. It would be an injustice to them to argue the question thus, for if they were entitled to it they ought to receive it at the hands of the Legislature with equal promptitude, whether they were many or few. He had known some

individuals of that religious persuasion, for whom he had the highest respect but he could not say he was at all aware of what the tenets of their Church was, from his acquaintance with these individuals. But he could quote the authority of Lord Hardwicke, and some of the very first men of that great man's age and profession, all of whom were of opinion, that Popery and slavery were indivisible, and followed one in the train of the other, unless the advocates of the Catholic wishes could shew that the Church of Rome had disclaimed by some decisive and satisfactory public acts all the vile and dangerous doctrines which it was well known they had held at the time of the Reformation, and consequently, it would be a Protestant Government, in legislating on the subject, to give the Roman Catholics credit at least for those sentiments which they themselves had so loudly challenged and proclaimed to the world. Their Lordships too were bound on their oath and conscience to support the Protestant Constitution of this country and a Protestant Throne. With these recollections deeply engraven on his mind, he felt he should, if he did not oppose the present motion, betray his duty to the House, his allegiance to his King, and set at nought all the knowledge he ever had derived of the laws and constitution of the realm.

Earl GREY said, he was not one of those whose censure seemed to be so much dreaded by the Noble and Learned Lord, nor had he ever entertained for a moment the idea described as a truism, that all lawyers were bad politicians. He must disavow a censure so illiberal and unmerited by so enlightened and numerous a class of society; but he thought he had seen a lawyer, and one of elevated rank too, indeed, occupying a seat at that moment within those walls, whose professionally casuistical habits had, he regretted, warped his mind and narrowed his views upon some subjects of general policy. Others he had known, and of whom he could speak with pleasure, whose legal attainments added solidity and weight to the general acquirements which constituted the scholar and the statesman. Such had been that eminent and excellent man whose loss all must deplore, who could recollect, with him, the profoundness of his legal research, and the amiable disposition of a mind ever anxious to apply, with healing influence, a remedy to the afflictions and wrongs of his fellow-creatures. He was unwilling to enter into a professional contest with so able an antagonist as the Noble Lord, but when the subject to be discussed happened to be connected with legal topics, he should not relinquish, on that account, his post, but using the best lights he had on the subject, support to the utmost the side on which he imagined justice lay. If the views of the Noble Lord were well founded, he conceived there must be an end of the question altogether; namely, that by the necessary construction of a Protestant Constitution, the introduction of our Catholic fellow-subjects into the bosom of the State was not only inexpedient, but inadmissible in principle. It would be necessary for the Noble Lord to define what he meant by a Constitution essentially Protestant. It would be also necessary to shew what was the tendency of any proposed alteration in the State, or how far it might militate against the Constitution. Upon this view of the question, he was prepared to combat the positions and arguments of the Noble Lord. He should grant, that by the Revolution our Constitution had been rendered fundamentally and essentially Protestant; in this way, that was to say, it had been provided by law, with a view to secure our religion from Catholic influence, and finally being overwhelmed, thereby that our Monarch should be a professor of the established religion. So said the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement. As adjuncts to these principal bulwarks or securities, others which might be denominated collateral had been added at different times; some previously, others subsequently to the period of the passing these Acts. The most of these arose out of circumstances very peculiar, and upon occasions in which it was impossible the country could ever feel itself again placed. These provisions, in fact, were no longer necessary from the change which had since taken place in the circumstance from which these Acts had emanated. That the Constitution was free, was no more true than that it was fundamentally and essentially Protestant.

The Noble Lord he expected would have been the last man in that House to have contended, that these collateral Acts of the Legislature were so intimately connected with these fundamental securities of the State, that it was impossible to change or withdraw them. He here enumerated a number of these collateral securities, as they were then considered, and shewed how freely the Legislature had questioned the sacredness of their character. The 4th of Anne had, although of this description, shared the fate of many others, and was subsequently repealed. By the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement, frequent Parliaments had been enjoined. The Triennial Bill was therefore passed and in another reign, that of George I, it was repealed. All these had been enacted under circumstances, which appeared to justify the spirit and temper in which they had been passed. Yet the Noble and Learned Lord, who had not hesitated in many instances, to lay his daring hands on the sacred and hallowed bulwarks of the Constitution, would insist upon it in this instance, that the House, to his own phrase, was stopped. What were laws made to affect the property or protect the lives of his Majesty's subjects, alone liable to remodification, whilst laws of a constitutional and fundamental character were above revision or repeal by that very Legislature which adopted them? He had a high respect for Lord Hardwicke's opinion, but in the opinion said to be given by him, he regretted he could not help charging him with some of the asperity of the times. The real state of the question was, whether the securities now considered necessary were sufficient? The system of exclusion, it should be previously observed, was not founded on the enactments of the Bill of Rights or Act of Settlement, but upon other Acts, viz. the Corporation Act, passed in the first year after the Restoration, to exclude the supporters of Cromwell, as being disaffected men, from power. The next was the Test

Act, ostensibly passed against Papists, but in fact levelled against the then Duke of York, a well-known Roman Catholic, though the next heir to the Crown. Then followed the 30th of Charles II, which extended the system of exclusion to a much greater extent. How this last could have been pronounced an act of deliberate wisdom by the Noble Lord, for the purpose of defending the Constitution, he could not conceive. He should not have forgotten the history of the times in which these Acts had been passed. It was during the popular excitement created by the discovery of the plots of Oates, Beddoe, and other disturbers of the public mind, that these violent enactments had been passed. The nation suffered itself to be deceived by false appearances of a false plot, and became the dupes of its own fears.

The Act of the first of George I, was passed also with a limited and precise object. This object was to cut off from all hope the Pretender's friends, were at that period well received by the French King, the most powerful Catholic Prince in Europe. The reasons for the Act have like that of the others ceased. The family of the Stewarts are extinct, their partisans no more. He hoped he never should hear it repeated, that the system of exclusion, though it might form part of our political system, constituted part of our religion. The policy was that of our ancestors, and was of their time exclusively; it had now ceased. The throne was not only Protestant, but every avenue to it was guarded by a Protestant nobility, Protestant gentry, and Protestant people. To conclude the system of exclusion the Act of 1699 was passed, prohibiting Catholics to take by devise or purchase any property in lands whatever. In the passing this Bill an indecent outrage was committed on the House, and Mr. Burke had well described the double injustice of these two parties in the State, who with perfect sang froid, as if they had been playing at cups and balls, thus inhumanly sported with the lives and properties of these poor people then the objects of popular resentment. The Legislature, however, became ashamed of its conduct, and the Bill was repealed; would it after this vacillation on the part of the Legislature on subjects alleged to be of such delicacy, be contended that the hands of the House were tied? or was the Noble or Learned Lord prepared whilst quoting Locke and Lord Somers, disposed to go all the way with these authorities, and say, that it was no longer a question whether Papacy was a religion to be tolerated, but whether it were not a crime to be punished? Against such a sentence he should appeal even to the Rev. Prelates themselves, who no doubt had assembled so strongly in support of the Constitution. When the Bill for the abolition of the Slave Trade was under the discussion of the Legislature, the Learned Lord had sought, in the writings of the learned man, for arguments not for the removal, for the prevention and annihilation of that inhuman traffic, but for its support and its continuance, and he then quoted the resolutions of South Carolina. That illustrious man, whose writings contributed so much to the dissemination of useful knowledge, was brought forward by the Noble and Learned Lord as a prop for the fabric of intolerance; if any prejudice had rested in his works, which his enlightened mind would have spurned, if he had the good fortune to live at the present times, and some, it was true, yet remained in the pages of his immortal writings, ought they to be now selected and upheld to their Lordships as the frailties of that great man, as the remnant of the darkness which he had so much laboured to remove, but of which a small portion had slightly tinged his mind! Ought they to be seized on with avidity as argument for intolerance! No, had Mr. Locke now lived, he would combat for the truths of human nature: for the civil liberty of every subject. The circumstance which led Mr. Locke into mistakes respecting the privileges of the Catholics, no longer existed, and with the proofs which were brought forward of the fallacy, under which he laboured during his life, who would dare to say, that he who dispelled the clouds of error and threw a blaze of light on the human understanding, would not have laid aside the errors of that age, and have now laboured again to remove the prejudices and illusions of the present period! The question of supremacy next demanded his attention.

The Noble and Learned Lord had declared, that he conceived it impossible to distinguish between temporal and spiritual supremacy. Was the Noble and Learned Lord, who had so much studied the history of the Constitution, ignorant of the distinction made in that respect before the reign of Henry VIII? If the Noble and Learned Lord looked at the oath which the Act of 1793 imposed on the Catholics, if he had either at that time read it, or in the course of his profession perused it, he would have found, that in it a clear distinction was made between spiritual and temporal supremacy. If the dread which seemed to weigh so heavily on the Noble Lord's mind was likely to be increased, from the contention which he feared from the influence of the Pope in this country, why had he forgotten to observe the conduct of foreign Catholic kingdoms relative to that influence? The Emperors of Germany and the Kings of France combatted that influence, and the Catholic Monarchs of England yielded none of their rights to the power of the Popes, when that power was in its zenith. Was the allegiance to these sovereigns lessened when the thunders of the Vatican were fulminated against them? Had the authority of the Popes lessened the civil power in Austria or in France? Were the subjects of these realms less willing to obey the mandates of their sovereigns, when these Sovereigns were at open variance with the Popes, in consequence of their privileges, for which they so long contended? No, the safety of the state and their allegiance to their sovereigns, and the preservation of their privileges, were considered far superior to the spiritual supremacy of a Pope, who claimed what to him belonged not. When Edward the First laid claim to and therefore prepared to make himself master of the kingdom of Scotland, he was desired by the Pope to desist from his attack, and to prosecute his claim at the Court of Rome; the gallant Monarch replied, that in the assembly of the Barons of

England he would assert his right, and, when they admitted it, he would not suffer any Potentate, under pretence of supremacy, to wrest it from him.—[The Noble Lord here read the reply of King Edward, which boldly declared, that he would send no prolocutor to a foreign Power to plead for him, or to establish his rights: he would establish his claim in the presence of his country, and with its strength he would defend it.]—This was a specimen of the spiritual obedience afforded by the subjects of England even in times when darkness and superstition were said to have overshadowed the political horizon. But at present, in times when the darkness was removed, when the lights of civil knowledge illumined the globe, were the fears of the Noble Lord to be cherished—fears of which the experience of past ages had demonstrated the folly? The arguments of the Noble and Learned Lord were therefore the offsprings of an exploded and deservedly forgotten system of prejudice and narrow policy. The Emperor of Germany and the King of France, it was replied to Edward, are favourable to the Pope, and will combat against you. "I will give them both battle," said the courageous Monarch, "and will defend my rights and my kingdom." In the succeeding reigns of Edward III, Richard II, of the 4th, 5th, and 6th Henries, various examples could be given of the resistance of the Barons of England against any usurpation of their rights by the Popes of those times. Nor were the Barons the only opposers of the Pope, the Prelates united with them, for the preservation of the privileges of this country. Yet could the Noble and Learned Lord on the Woolsack not now distinguish between spiritual and temporal supremacy of the subjects of this country although the history of this country clearly established it? Next the doctrines avowed by the Roman Catholics, and the loyalty always displayed by them gave a complete and an extended refutation of the arguments adduced by the Noble and Learned Lord.

While Catholics filled the Throne of this country, and until the time of the Reformation, it was clearly proved that the Catholics contended against the assumptions of the Popes. What had been their conduct subsequent to that period? In the reign of Elizabeth whose title to the throne of this kingdom was not admitted by the Papal See, the general disposition of the Catholics, notwithstanding the severe and bloody enactments passed against them in that reign, had been unfavourable to her continuance on the throne. Even at the time when the most powerful Potentate then in Europe, with the sanction of the existing Pope, collected a mighty army, and the large fleet, which was then called the invincible Armada, the Catholics, although smarting under the lash of sanguinary laws, although the Reformation, which so much despoiled their Church, had but lately taken place, adhered to the Sovereign of their country, manned her fleet, and bravely bled for the freedom of their country. What unfortunate consequence could be adduced as resulting from Catholics being then in possession of seats in the Houses of Parliament, a right which they then possessed? Was the conduct of the persons professing that religion other than that of loyal subjects during the reign of Charles the First, and during the wars which were necessarily caused by his misconduct, when Hampden was joined by many, of whom he (Lord Grey) would have been one, had he then lived? The Revolution, it was evident, was not founded on the fears of Catholic loyalty, but from a dread of despotism in a bigotted Sovereign; nor had the articles of Union precluded the Legislature of the nation from removing the disabilities or the oppressions under which any portion of their fellow-subjects might have laboured. The articles of the Union with Ireland, it was true, provided for the preservation of the religion which was established in the State, but they did not contain one word to prevent the removal of the disabilities which affect that portion of the subjects of the country who professed the Catholic doctrines. Instead of expressing any objection to such a measure, a contrary interpretation had very strong grounds for being supported. His Majesty's Ministers who drew up these articles foresaw the necessity which would arise of an investigation of these disabilities as well as of their removal.—(Hear, hear!)—No doubt could be entertained that if the Irish Parliament had continued, that Catholics would have been restored to the freedom which they had formerly possessed.

The 4th article of the Union stipulated that certain regulations should continue in force until Parliament should otherwise provide. So far, therefore, from its being a fundamental principle in the articles of the Union with Ireland, the spirit of policy which dictated that measure found it necessary to look forward to the grant of civil liberty to the Catholic inhabitants of that country. It had been said, that power alone was now denied to the Catholics, for all other privileges had been granted to them. The Noble Lord as well as the Learned Prelate, seemed to suppose that all the officers in the army and in the navy as well as all the persons holding offices under the Government would be of that persuasion, as if his Majesty were immediately to exclude all his Protestant subjects, and select no other for these situations. The Catholics would then exceed all his other subjects in abilities and in perseverance, and the King would then choose only those, uncontrolled by any representation of Parliament. He would maintain that eligibility to offices of trust, when such eligibility was not injurious or detrimental to the welfare of the general body, was under a free Government, a civil right; and he therefore agreed with the Noble and Learned Prelate, in thinking that to deprive any class of subjects of that privilege, when not injurious to the welfare of the State was a great and flagrant injury. The safety of the country could be adduced as a sufficient objection against the possession of this right. But to the Catholics, power had been already given, in the grant of the right of election, in the holding situations in the army and navy, and of procuring for themselves lucrative employment at the Bar. Was it good policy at the present time to embody them in a separate class as if to encourage them to remain among their disabilities, and

instead of a community of interests, to wait until the hour of misfortune would give strength to enforce their demands? The motion of his Noble Friend proposed nothing final or decisive, and he saw nothing which could prevent their Lordships from going into the Committee to investigate the subject. The Noble Earl who sat on the opposite Bench, had always opposed the motion on former occasions, but his opposition was founded on principle and tempered with moderation and liberality.

The Noble Earl had not imputed any immoral or improper views to the Catholic petitioners, and if he recollected aright the arguments of the Noble Earl on the preceding discussions, his opposition to the motion was not founded on the ground of the Catholics believing in Transubstantiation, or in the invocation, or in the sacrifice of the mass. The system of exclusion was not defended for these reasons, the Greek and Russian Churches believed the same; and were the adopters of their doctrines to be excluded also, in case any of the inhabitants of this country should embrace them? If the system of exclusion was not necessary against them, why was the declaration to be continued? Each Member of Parliament, whatever his conviction, whatever his doubts, or whether he considered the subject or not, was called forward to the Table before he was admitted to his seat, and then obliged to swear to what he either knew nothing, or of which he perhaps felt some difficulty in forming an opinion. Why was this declaration, evidently burdensome on each Member who was thus compelled to form an opinion of which he might occasionally doubt, to be continued; had each Member so accurately investigated the Catholic doctrine respecting the Mass, as to be able to declare idolatry, or that of transubstantiation, or of the invocation of the Virgin Mary and of the Saints, as to be competent to pronounce it supererogation; ought not the conscience of the Protestant Member to be relieved from the burthen? These oaths to be revised, and such only exacted as would afford security to the State, which would require from the Catholics full security for the safety of the government and the Established Religion. An oath was eventually all that could be demanded of them and if that pledge of their fidelity was not rendered compatible with their feelings as men and as Christians, what security could the country require from them? Then, and only then, could it be expected that they would truly labour for the welfare of the country. Before he would conclude, he begged permission to make an observation relative to what he had heard from a Noble Lord, who had quoted some opinion of Dr. Milner's, as opposed to granting any relief to the Catholic body. He protested against any such opinion being considered as that of the general body. It was he suggested in 1813 a measure odious to the Catholic body, which was afterwards proved to be that of a vindictive spirit. Dr. Milner, he had authority for saying it, it was no longer the agent of the Irish Bishops. This result was evident from the events in 1810 and in 1813.

Of the expression of disappointed ambition or of irritation of one individual, no use ought to be made against the demands of a whole class of subjects.—The argument, therefore, for a continuation of the declaration on that account was not supported by reasons deserving attention. He conjured their Lordships to look around on the equals and rivals of Great Britain, on the United States of America, and on France. The United States, with an increased navy, with multiplied resources, and with redoubled strength, was threatening the colonies of Great Britain. The present, therefore, was the time to conciliate the subjects of this Kingdom. The situation of France ought also to be taken into consideration; in possession of a new Constitution, the energy of which resembles that of this country, France was now nearly relieved from debt, and her strength, her vigour was improved. The feelings of France and of America towards England were those of jealousy and revenge, which they would hereafter feel delight in indulging. Ought not, therefore, the greatest endeavour be made for the consolidation of the interests of the subjects of Great Britain, oppressed as she was with a load of taxes, with circulating medium resembling that which passed in France when on the eve, as it was said, of bankruptcy? These were the dangers which now surrounded Great Britain, and it could be called little less than madness, not at least to labour to unite all her children together. The morbid state of Ireland had been caused by the long continued system of misgovernment practised in that country, and it therefore became the duty of the Legislature to endeavour to soothe those of the inhabitants of that country, who had been either neglected or oppressed, that united in heart and mind the subjects of this kingdom might be prepared to meet danger when it should be assailed.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL maintained, that the demand of the Catholics was for the absolute possession of power, or for nothing. There were some other minor grounds stated, but the question on these minor grounds could, and ought to be discussed separately, and he hoped that their Lordships would not now enter into a discussion of them. The main object of the Catholics was the obtaining of seats in Parliament, and of admission into the Privy Council. This could be clearly proved by their conduct in the other House in 1813, when a Bill for their relief was before the House, and one of his Noble Friends, then a Member of that House, had procured the adoption of a clause to prevent any persons of that communion from being Members either of Parliament, or of the Privy Council. The Bill was withdrawn by its supporters, because that cause had been admitted. The present application was therefore for power or for nothing. The lateness of the hour, and frequency of the discussion, rendered his speaking fully on the subject unnecessary. The Noble Lord had made an attack on his Noble Friend on the Woolstack, for which he could see no foundation, for he perfectly agreed with his Noble Friend in thinking that the settlement at the Revolution was founded on the religion of the State being Protestant. He would maintain that the principle of the Revolution was founded in a connexion between the Church and State. Our ancestors at that time, his Lordship observed, had already seen two great Revolutions affecting the safety of both the Church and State at the same time. The first was that effected by the Puritans in the reign of Charles I, to

which succeeded the attempt of popery to overthrow the Constitution. They therefore inferred a necessary connexion between Church and State, and that in order to preserve each, the Government should be Protestant with a Protestant King, and Protestant ministers of Government. He wished to enquire on what principle it could be maintained that the King should be Protestant, and yet that his immediate and responsible advisers should not be Protestant. Although the general principle of hereditary succession to the Throne had been firmly established, yet rather than that there should not be a Protestant King, this principle had been broken. If then a principle so fully recognised had been set aside so as to exclude from the lead of the Government an individual whose scruples might be conscientious, ought not the same policy to apply still more strongly in offices of Ministerial importance? With all his reverence for the establishment made at the time of the Revolution, yet if he could be convinced that there was injustice in it, he would be the last man to stand up in support of it. If it could be supposed thirty years before the death of Charles I. that a revolution would take place, would it not have been proper to establish precautionary laws? Again, would not precautionary laws have been proper if the events which took place in the reign of Charles II. had been foreseen? After many years' consideration he thought the principle of the exclusion now complained of was most just. The principle itself, as he often had occasion to state, was, that if one class of subjects give an unqualified allegiance, whereas another class give only a qualified allegiance, it was but fair that the former should have a greater degree of power in the civil and religious interests of the country. This was a consideration of both Church and State united; and they who differ from the former have no right to expect a degree of participation in the latter equal to that which they enjoy who are united in allegiance to the Constitution both civil and religious. The objection to the Roman Catholics is not merely that they do not acknowledge the established religion of the country, but that they acknowledge a foreign Power to have the right of controlling the subjects of this Empire in affairs of the gravest importance. This difference of the Roman Catholics from other Dissenters, arises, he was ready to admit, from honourable and conscientious scruples, but how was it possible to omit that consideration in examining the nature of their claim to a full participation in the benefits of the Constitution? There are, his Lordship observed, several classes of Dissenters, and amongst others the Quakers, a very deserving and respectable body of men, who are excluded from the benefits of the Constitution, in consequence of their religious scruples. In the last century there was a numerous class who no longer exist, the Nonjurors, who like the Roman Catholics in the present day could not obtain equal rights in consequence of their religious scruples.

If he were asked whether there was any ground for making a distinction between Spirituals and Temporals, he would answer, Not and if it did exist in any Church, it could, least of all be said to exist in the Church of Rome, according to whose doctrines the very principle of spiritual jurisdiction applied to a great mass of temporal jurisdiction; and amongst other instances he might mention its application in the case of marriage and divorce; and to a still greater degree in the case of auricular confession. In a Government essentially Protestant, ought their Lordships to admit persons who hold opinions essentially different from their fundamental laws? If they would uphold their Protestant Constitution, they ought to uphold those laws to which they were indebted for the Constitution which they enjoy. [Hear, hear!]—He had no doubt that the Roman Catholics are as conscientiously convinced that their opinions are right as any other body of dissenters are; but it was to be considered, that other dissenters from the Church are divided into a variety of classes and interests, and are not therefore likely to occasion any serious or permanent injury to the Established Church; whereas the Roman Catholics are one body united under one head, which has a most important concurrent jurisdiction with their hierarchy; whose discipline and system are also one. His Lordship's next argument against the motion before the House was, that it would be impossible to satisfy the Roman Catholics by any concession short of an entire equalisation of power; and in illustration of this assertion, he referred to a letter written by Mr. Burke to Sir Hercules Langrishe, in which he treated with ridicule the idea, that to grant part of their Claims would lead to a further demand on their part. The very Session after concessions were then made to the Roman Catholics had scarcely commenced, his Lordship said, when there was a demand on their part for a further grant. What, he would ask, was there in the state of Ireland to warrant further concessions at present? Is the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland of such a nature as not to give rise to apprehension? Their Lordships knew that all persons who conscientiously believe in their opinions, will seek an opportunity to extend the influence of them, and the state of the Roman hierarchy was such as that it would be absurd to suppose that concessions would not lead to further demands. In making this assertion, he did not at all allude to the opinions of Dr. Meyler, but to that of a Roman Catholic distinguished for his rank, he meant Sir J. Throckmorton who, in a book written with great care and deliberation, stated it as his opinion that the time will soon arrive when Bishopsricks will be alternately held by Roman Catholic and Protestant Prelates. He (Lord Liverpool) could never understand how to grant a part of their claims would tend to set the wishes of the Roman Catholics at rest. At present they give their votes at general elections only to Protestants, but if the power of eligibility should be confirmed upon themselves, would it not tend to produce animosity between them and their Protestant rivals?—[Hear!]—If the mass of the population were by the proposed change to be made more happy or rich, he might think something of these changes, but in fact any alteration which might be made beyond that which had already been done would be only a dead letter to the great mass. A few Nobles, indeed might be benefited by the proposed alteration. If the change which was sought to be effected would allay animosity, it would have a beneficial effect; but for his part, he professed that he did not see how this object was to be effected by it.

He should next allude to an argument which had been brought forward in favour of the motion, namely, that in Roman Catholic countries, the Sovereigns of these countries were never limited in the exercise of their just political rights by the operation of the Roman Catholic Religion. But this, if admitted so far as regards Roman Catholic Sovereigns, affords no argument in favour of Roman Catholics living under a Protestant Government, because in a country where the religion is Catholic, the whole temporalities of the Church which are in the power of the Sovereign tend to counteract the effect of foreign influence. If the Catholic Religion were established in Ireland, then there might not be any great danger in granting the claims of the Catholics. If he could see any great public

advantage from granting these claims, even under the present circumstances, he would be willing to sacrifice theory to it, but he was unwilling to sacrifice a great public principle for the advantage of a few persons. Their Lordships ought to recollect the blessings which the country enjoyed for the last century, and hesitate before they would give their assent to remove those Protestant laws under which the morals and religion of the country had so long prospered.—(Hear, hear, hear!)

The Marquis of LANSDOWNE, after some prefatory observations, observed that it was as unjust to charge the Catholics of the present day with the errors committed by Catholics some centuries ago, as it would be unjust to charge that most respectable sect called Quakers, with the folly and the violence which prevailed amongst some of their early followers, or as it would be unjust to charge the venerable Prelates of the Established Church in the present day with the absurd political notions of a pure divine right of Kings, and with other exaggerated doctrines, which were countenanced by canons of the 17th century. If the principle which the Noble Earl (Lord Liverpool) had laid down, namely, the diminution of privilege in proportion to the diminution of allegiance, were to be admitted, then they ought to exclude the Dissenters and the whole kingdom of Scotland, for the whole Kirk of Scotland would not acknowledge the supremacy of the Crown. Was there any duty, he would ask, which the Catholics owe to the country and are unwilling to grant? If there be any thing in the oaths which can render the allegiance of the Catholics greater to the Crown, they are willing to amend the oaths accordingly. Parliament had already made the experiment, and proved the regard which Catholics entertain for their oaths. Parliament had attached those oaths as a security, and if after the experience of forty years that the danger apprehended from the Catholics was removed by these oaths, were their Lordships to be told that no security could be derived from oaths which might be administered to the Catholics. If there were any danger in admitting Catholics to offices of importance, he would contend that greater danger was to be apprehended from the power already conferred on Catholics in the army and navy, than could arise from their obtaining those privileges for which they were now seeking. He thought that the law as it now stands, was a great inconsistency, or rather a mass of inconsistencies, for it operates in a different manner in each of our Establishments. In Scotland a Catholic is endowed with capacities for certain offices; in Ireland he had no capacities; and in Canada he was capable of attaining every situation. Thus did the law vary respecting a being who, as their Lordships were informed, had remained immutable, and was incapable of change. His Lordship afterwards commented with force and point upon the charge that Catholics are incapable of enjoying equal rights under the same Government with a Protestant people. In proof of the contrary of this, his Lordship noticed the union of the Netherlands (where the inhabitants are bigotted Catholics), with Holland, in which country the people are remarkable for their zeal in the support of a Protestant form of religion. His Lordship concluded a long and argumentative speech in favour of the Catholic Claims by saying, that if after the Catholics were placed upon something like an equal footing with their fellow subjects, they should attempt to bring forward any ecclesiastical claims, he would be as ready as any man to resist them in so doing.—(Hear, hear!)

Strangers were now ordered to withdraw, and after the order had been repeated several times, many were in the act of retiring, when

The Earl of WESTMORELAND rose, but owing to the confusion which prevailed by the rushing back of the strangers who were retiring, we were unable to hear the commencement of his Lordship's speech distinctly. In the course of his speech we understood the Noble Lord to say, that he would give the motion his negative, as tending to excite civil dissensions and disorders. He thought that the House ought not to go into a Committee without knowing on what grounds it was to proceed, lest one class of the people should suppose that it was in contemplation to grant every thing, and another might suppose that it was in order to renew that Bill which not long since had passed the other House, but which the Roman Clergy declared to be a Bill of pains and penalties. He thought that the present time was peculiarly unfavourable for the consideration of the Catholic Claims, and that among the many circumstances which had tended to produce this change unfavourable to the Catholics, the violent manner in which they had rejected all proposals on the subject of securities might be considered as the principal one. His Lordship referred to a letter written by the present Pope, in which he states, that Buonaparte having proposed to him that religious worship should be free, he (the Pope) rejected it both as being contrary to a Decree of the Common Council, and in consequence of the evils which would follow from such a measure. It appeared strange to him, his Lordship said, that they who seek for religious equality should be unwilling to grant toleration to those who may differ from them on subjects of religion. In illustration of the principles of the Roman Catholics, his Lordship referred to the restoration of the Jesuits, to the suppression of Bible Societies, and the persecution of the Protestants at Nismes. It was strange, he said, that if this were a popular question in England, it had not been brought forward as a ground to recommend any candidate at the late general elections. While these elections were going on the Noble Lords had been as mute as mice upon the subject of Catholic Claims.—(A laugh).—Every candidate who wished to be popular kept it out of sight, and by some unaccountable circumstance the names of the persons who voted in favour of these Claims in the other House, were not made known to the Public. Could he be persuaded that the concessions claimed would finally tranquillise Ireland, he would go greater lengths to allow the object. What was the opinion of Mr. Pitt on this question? Why, he thought it would be desirable; but he, poor man,—(A laugh).—not possessing the prophetic mind of several Noble Lords who had spoken, saw the necessity of obtaining security. With these views he should certainly vote against the motion.

The Earl of CARNARVON believed, that if the differences existing should be referred to a Committee, there existed but little doubt of their being adjusted. The concessions already yielded admitted the Catholics into the Military profession, which was in fact placing the sword in the hands of those in whom sufficient confidence is wanting to entrust with civil power. It appeared that no one could be admitted into Offices of State unless he acknowledged the supremacy of the King. Now he should wish to know whether the Methodists and Jumpers might not as well be called upon so to do. He hoped their Lordships would not be influenced by the chimerical evils that had been held up to their affrighted imaginations, but rather by pursuing the spirit of unanimity and conciliation, heal the grievances of Ireland.

The Duke of WELLINGTON considered, that the question rested upon the security that could be given by the Catholics for the protection of the Protestant Church as established in Ireland. He must confess, that as yet he had not heard of any thing proposed that could be accepted. There could not be a doubt but the same desire was cherished by the Catholic Church to restore the power and influence they had lost; nor was such a feeling unreasonable, when it was considered, that the Protestant Church had been established in Ireland by the sword, and not by the conversion of the people. Another difficulty was, as to the Oath of Allegiance; he could not perceive how it could be administered, and if this were to be dispensed with, it would be in opposition to the established laws of the Constitution; according to which, every one was responsible to the Government; but what kind of responsibility would attach to Bishops elected. God knew how, and appointed by a foreign Potentate? No man was more anxious than himself that this question should be settled; if a standard could be obtained, there would be some guide, but he had not been enabled to perceive that any thing of the kind had been proposed, and until that should be effected, he felt himself bound to oppose the motion.

Earl DARNLEY did not consider the question in the same light as the Noble Duke, who appeared to have taken it in an ecclesiastical view. Such security as had been contemplated he did not consider necessary; with security or without security he was ready to go into a Committee, because he thought attention to the Claims of the Catholics would be the only means of securing their attachment to the Constitution. Loud cries of *Question, question!* followed the conclusion of the Noble Earl's speech.

Strangers were ordered to withdraw, and the House divided, when there were—

Contents, 70—Proxies, 36 . . . . .	106
Non-Contents, 97—Proxies, 50 . . . . .	147
Majority against the Motion . . . . .	41

The House adjourned at Half past One.

## Commercial Reports.

The following abstract of a Quarterly Sale of Drugs, &c. held at the East India House, from the 10th to the 14th of May, is taken from the Exchange Price Current. References—R. reduction on the previous Quarterly Sale. A. advance on the same.

**Salt Petre**—407 Tons, refraction 7½ to 22½ per cent 35-6 to 36-6 per cwt. 144 Tons, chiefly sold according to quality and refraction at 34 to 40-6. R. 9d. to 1s. 6d. per cwt.

**Ginger**—Malabar, smooth-coated smallish root, breaking generally white but wormy, 19 to 20 per cwt. R. 10 to 13 per cwt. Bengal, smooth-coated fair root, partly bold, partly small, 22 to 25-6. R. 6 to 8 6. Rough coated middling root, breaking partly white, partly dark, and some wormy, 20 to 21-6. R. 7-6 to 8.

**Benjamin**—1 chest middling second 18l. 10 chests good and middling thirds 7l. 5s. to 8l. 19s. R. 16 to 20s.

**Borax**—250 chests partly fair crystals and pretty bold, partly small and crusted, 84 to 85. R. 16 to 20.

**Castor Oil**—42 chests fair firsts, generally cool pale oil, 3s. to 3s. 4d. per lb. 27 chests middling ditto, rather high coloured, 2-7 to 2-10. A. 1d to 2d. per lb.

**Lac Dye**—61 chests DT 5s. 6d. to 6s. 3d. per lb. 29 chests TL LD in thin flat squares, reddish outside, rather strong scented, breaking dark, and not very resinous, 3s. 2d. to 3s. 6d.

**Amijet**—13,531 bundles, sound fair root, generally small, 30s. to 38s. 3,920 bundles, coarse inferior root, 25s. to 26s.

**Shell Lac**—50 chests fair orange Lac, generally free, partly small plates and some rather blocky, 6l. to 6l. 5s. 58 chests common sort, dark coloured but free, 60s. R. 9s. to 10s.

**Stick Lac**—200 bags, small dark reddish Lac, with some Stick, 38s. to 39s. A. 8s. to 9s.

**Tincol**—270 chests, generally of fair quality, and will refine at a loss of 12½ per cent, and some more oily and inferior 85s. to 90s. R. 97s. to 100s.

**Sugar**—243 bags Beerboom, 42s. to 50s. 6d. 269 bags soft grained white, and yellowish white, 49s. to 52s. 6d. 270 bags soft demi-white, 45s. to 45s. 6d. 100 bags of inferior yellow, 35s. to 35s. 6d. 582 bags of dark moist Bengal brown 22s. to 23s.

**Cotton**—Bengal 5d. to 7d. The market continues much depressed both by the weight of stock and other unfavorable circumstances operating at this time, but whenever the importation slackens, some improvement in price may be anticipated.

**Indigo**—The Company's Sale, consisting of 9712 chests, took place on the 22d of April, when 3,700 chests were bought in by the proprietors. Good and fine shipping Indigoes supported or nearly so, the prices of the Company's sale in October last; good and decided home consuming Indigoes, sold at a reduction of 4d. to 6d. per lb.; common Indigo at a reduction of 6d. to 8d. and mixed ordinary and inferior at a reduction of 9d. to 1s. 3d. per lb.

## COURSE OF EXCHANGE.

REMIT	CALCUTTA	[DRAW]
2s. 6d.	On London, at six Months' sight, per Sicca Rupee,	2s. 7d.
	On Bombay, 30 Days' sight, per 100 Ro. Rs. Sa. Ra.	
	On Madras, 30 Days' sight, per 100 St. Pag. Sa. Ra.	